Proudler teaches routing an incoming call to either a cellular phone or a cordless phone, which each has its respective base station. Inahara teaches managing the channels used in radio transmission, with each slave unit transmitting radio signals on a specific channel to a master unit in a one-way communication. As the present application describes on page 2, lines 21-26, the cordless communication system takes over the functions of a base station of a mobile communication network, i.e., the functions of a home location register and an authentication center. **The combination of Proudler and Inahara would not result in such a "take over" as described in Claims 12 and 20.**

In addition, Inahara fails to teach an identification module of a base station and a chip card of a mobile terminal, wherein sections of data of the identification module are identical to sections of data stored on the chip card of the mobile terminal. Proudler also fails to teach this limitation, as the Examiner acknowledged in the Office Action.

Moreover, Inahara fails to teach a base station that authenticates a mobile terminal and fulfills the same functions and tasks as the home location register and the authentication center of a mobile communication system. The examiner stated in the Office Action that Proudler discloses a cellular system and that a cellular system usually contains a home location register and an authentication center. However, Claims 12 and 20 recite a base station **of a cordless communication system** fulfilling the functions and tasks of the home location register and authentication center of a mobile communication system. Neither Inhara nor Proudler teaches this limitation.

Therefore, combining Inahara with Proudler would not reach the method and system claimed in Claims 12 and 20.

Last but not least, there is no suggestion to combine Proudler with Inahara. Even if combining Proudler with Inahara were feasible, there is no motivation and no suggestion to do so. The Examiner does not explain why one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to invent a cordless system where the base station functions as a home location register.

For the above reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 12 and Claim 20 are allowable. All of the other pending claims which depend from Claims 12 and 20 are therefore allowable.

Response to Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) Over Proudler And Inahara In View Of Vu

Examiner rejected Claims 14 and 17-19 over Proudler and Inahara in view of Vu (US 6185436). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

First of all, Claims 14 and 17-19 depend from Claim 12, which is allowable for the reasons described above. Therefore, Claims 14 and 17-19 are allowable over the cited references.

Regarding the Examiner's rejection of Claim 14, Vu teaches a handset that stores different subscriber identity modules (SIMs), so that a user can switch between the SIMs to choose between service providers. The section cited by the Examiner in the Office Action, Vu Column 5 Lines 15-27, simply discloses storing subscriber identification numbers in the handset (a mobile terminal). Vu fails to teach storing in the identification module of the base station other data including allowed frequencies, a maximum permitted output powers for the base station and the mobile terminal, allowed services, and initialization parameters which a network carrier desires to influence and which constitute a general framework for the operation of the base station.

Regarding the Examiner's rejection of Claims 17-19, Vu teaches a processor within the handset (a mobile terminal) that rests for a predetermined time and scans to determine the contents of SIMs stored in the handset. See Vu Column 5, Lines 56-60. Vu fails to teach programming a timer within the base station to a predetermined time by a network carrier, and automatically resetting the time by a subscriber if an authorized use occurs, wherein the base station, if not used after the predetermined time has lapsed, loses authorization to operate a transmitter at frequencies assigned to the mobile communication system.

Therefore, combining Proudler, Inahara and Vu would not reach the methods claimed in Claims 14 and 17-19.

Last but not least, there is no suggestion to combine Proudler, Inahara and Vu. Even if combining Proudler, Inahara and Vu were feasible, there is no motivation and no suggestion to combine them.

For the above reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 14 and 17-19 are allowable.

CONCLUSION

Applicant has endeavored to address all of the Examiner's concerns in the outstanding Office Action. In light of the above remarks, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the pending Claims 12-22.

If any issues require clarification, Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned attorney.

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: 6/28/02

By: _____

John M. Carson
Registration No. 34,303
Attorney of Record
620 Newport Center Drive
Sixteenth Floor
Newport Beach, CA 92660
(619)-235-8550

AMEND
H:\DOCS\RXS\RXS-1816.DOC
062402